

REMARKS

Claims 34-43 are presented for examination. Claims 34, 35, 38, 41, and 42 are independent. Claim 35 is hereby amended. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-33 were previously canceled without prejudice. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 34-35, 37-38, and 40-43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,269,336 (Ladd) in view of U.S. Patent 5,634,084 (Malsheen). Claims 36 and 39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ladd in view of Malsheen and in further view of U.S. Patent 6,501,832 (Saylor). Applicant respectfully submits that claims 34-43 are patentable over the cited art, for the following reasons.

Independent claim 34 recites, in part:

a prompt mapping configuration comprising a plurality of prompt classes, a plurality of occurrences of at least one text string, and a one-to-one association between each of the occurrences and a corresponding audio segment identifier, the prompt mapping configuration adapting the processor to specify a first text string having occurrences in multiple prompt classes;

The Office Action states on Page 6 that the above claim element is disclosed in Ladd at col. 18, lines 33-44 and col. 29, lines 36-57. These passages of Ladd disclose a PROMPT element of a markup language used to define content that is to be presented to the user. Ladd's PROMPT element can be contained within a STEP or a CLASS element. Col. 29, lines 36-57 state that an AUDIO element of the markup language specifies an audio file that should be played. The AUDIO element can be contained within (among others) a PROMPT element.

Applicant respectfully submits that these passages of Ladd do not disclose the above claim element. In particular, these passages of Ladd do not disclose a prompt mapping configuration comprising a plurality of prompt classes, a plurality of occurrences of at least one text string, and a one-to-one association between each of the occurrences and a corresponding audio segment identifier, as claimed. There are no prompt classes in Ladd. Ladd's PROMPT element defines content that is to be

presented to Ladd's user, but Ladd is silent as to a plurality of prompt classes. Further, there is no prompt mapping configuration comprising prompt classes, occurrences of text string(s), and a one-to-one association between the occurrences and corresponding audio segment identifiers in Ladd.

On page 4, the Office Action relies on Malsheen as disclosing prompt classes. The Office Action specifically refers to col. 7, lines 4-35, Abstract, Table I, col. 7, lines 20-35, col. 9, lines 30-60, col. 10, lines 25-62, and col. 2, lines 53-60 of Malsheen as disclosing prompt classes. These passages of Malsheen describe an abbreviation translation table. Applicant respectfully submits that Malsheen does not disclose prompt classes. Malsheen's abbreviation table does not include prompt classes but rather is a table illustrating expansion possibilities for abbreviations. There are no prompts, or prompt classes described in these passages of Malsheen. As a result, Ladd, alone or in combination with Malsheen or any other art of record, does not teach or suggest the above claim element.

Independent claim 34 also recites, in part:

a prompt audio object, which, in response to receiving the document, adapts the processor to use the contextual information to determine a prompt class, match a text string from the document received by the voice browser to one of the plurality of occurrences of the at least one text string by searching only within the prompt class

The Office Action refers, on Page 3, to col. 10, lines 13-21, col. 16, lines 41-57, col. 18, lines 33-39, and col. 29, lines 36-57 of Ladd as disclosing the above claim element. Applicant respectfully submits that col. 10, lines 13-21 of Ladd describes playing a pre-recorded message to a user when the user states a key word or phrase. Col. 16, lines 41-57 describe STEP elements defining states within a DIALOG element. Col. 18, lines 33-39 describe a PROMPT element. Col. 29, lines 36-57 describe an AUDIO element that, when interpreted by Ladd's voice browser, a prompt will be played to Ladd's user. Applicant respectfully submits that Ladd's prompt is a prompt that is played when a specific AUDIO element is interpreted by Ladd's voice browser. Ladd does not teach or suggest a prompt class, using contextual information to determine a prompt class, or matching a text string from the document received by the voice browser to one of the plurality of occurrences

of the at least one text string by searching only within the prompt class. There are no prompt classes in Ladd and, consequently, there is no searching of a text string within a prompt class.

Malsheen does not cure the deficiencies of Ladd. Malsheen describes each word in a text being assigned a classification value with regard to syntax, punctuation, and membership in several predefined classes of words (e.g., numbers, measurement units, geographic destinations, and date/time values). (Col. 5, lines 30-50). Malsheen further describes an abbreviation table and a text expander procedure that expands abbreviations (see, e.g., col. 9, line 20 - col. 10, line 46).

Malsheen does not teach or suggest a prompt class, using contextual information to determine a prompt class, or matching a text string from a document received by the voice browser to one of the plurality of occurrences of the at least one text string by searching only within the prompt class. There is no prompt class in Malsheen. Further, there is no searching only within a particular prompt class in Malsheen. Malsheen's class of words are not prompt classes but are rather particular word types, such as numbers and measurement units.

Independent claim 34 also recites, in part:

wherein the match, through the association of text string occurrences to audio segment identifiers, results in identification of an audio segment identifier associated with the matched text string occurrence, and cause rendering of an audio segment, referenced in the database, that is identified by the audio segment identifier associated with the matched text string occurrence.

Neither Ladd nor Malsheen disclose the above claim element. In particular, Ladd does not disclose a match between a text string from a document to one of a plurality of occurrences of a text string by searching only within a prompt class. Similarly, Malsheen's word class is not a prompt class but rather a category of a word, such as a number, time/date, geographic destinations, etc. Therefore, neither Ladd nor Malsheen disclose the above claim element.

Claims 36 and 39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ladd in view of Malsheen and in further view of U.S. Patent 6,501,832 (Saylor). Saylor does not, however, cure the deficiencies noted above. Saylor describes a system

and method for registering voice codes ("VCodes") associated with stored content corresponding to the VCodes, wherein the VCode may be used to access the stored content via telephone by calling a central number and entering the VCode or verbally describing the object, attraction or subject, in which case the verbal description is associated with a VCode or collection of VCodes. Saylor does not, however, disclose the above claim elements of independent claim 34.

As a result, Applicant submits that Ladd, alone or in combination with Malsheen or any other art of record, does not teach or suggest all of the elements of claim 34. Further, the claims that depend from independent claim 34 are also allowable over Ladd, alone or in combination with Malsheen, as they depend from an allowable independent claim. Additionally, independent claims 35, 38, 41, and 42, and the claims that depend from these independent claims, are also allowable over the cited art, alone or in combination, for the same reasons described above.

Having responded to all objections and rejections set forth in the outstanding Office Action, it is submitted that the currently pending claims are in condition for allowance and Notice to that effect is respectfully solicited. Additional characteristics or arguments may exist that distinguish the claims over the prior art cited by the Examiner, and Applicant respectfully preserves their right to present these in the future, should they be necessary. In the event that the Examiner is of the opinion that a brief telephone or personal interview will facilitate allowance of one or more of the above claims, he is respectfully requested to contact Applicant's undersigned representative.

The Applicant's attorney may be reached by telephone at 212-801-6729. All correspondence should continue to be directed to the address given below, which is the address associated with Customer Number 76058.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any required fee in connection with the submission of this paper, any additional fees which may be required, now or in the future, or credit any overpayment to Account No. 50-1561. Please ensure that the Attorney Docket Number is referenced when charging any payments or credits for this case.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 8, 2010

/james j decarlo/
James J. DeCarlo
Reg. No. 36,120

Customer Number 76058
GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP
Met Life Building
200 Park Avenue, 34th Floor
New York, New York 10166
Phone: (212) 801-9200
Fax: (212) 801-6400